



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

*Am*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,767	04/01/2004	Randy Salo	000476C1	2795

23696 7590 05/12/2005

Qualcomm Incorporated  
Patents Department  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, CA 92121-1714

EXAMINER

PRIETO, BEATRIZ

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/816,767

Applicant(s)

SALO ET AL.

Examiner

Prieto Beatriz

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This communication is in response to Application No. 10/816,767 filed 04/01/04, claims 1-21 have been examined and remain pending.
2. Acknowledgment in this application as a continuation-in-part under 35 U.S.C. 120 to Application No. 09/438,817, entitled "SECURE REMOTE ACCESS TO ENTERPRISE NETWORKS", filed November 10, 1999, abandoned as of 10/27/04.
3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following noted minor informality: the clause "the requisite browser data" lack antecedent basis", correction is required.

***Claim Rejection under 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jammes et. al. (US 6,484,149 B1) (referred to as **Jammes** hereafter) in view of Gregg et. al. (US 6,516,416 B2) (referred to as **Gregg** hereafter).

Regarding claim 1, Jammes teaches a system as shown on Figs. 1-3, comprising:

- a “remote access” device (102) coupled to a “data” network (104) (Fig. 1, col 8/lines 34-41), the remote device having browser (102) capabilities to accommodate a request inputted by a “subscriber” user to access the “subscriber information” data (col 9/lines 1-8; col 6/lines 17-20, 41-58, user input see col 21/lines 11-14);

- a “an application gateway” server (106) hosting the subscriber information (col 12/lines 1-10, col 6/lines 22-30 and info including col 6/lines 66-col 7/line 7), the application gateway server comprising:

- a navigation module (350/352) for receiving data in a predetermined (e.g. HTTP and/or URL) format (see Fig. 3, col 17/lines 55-58) and accessing information (called “device specific”) associated with said received data (col 9/lines 1-10, col 7/lines 8-17, 30-39, col 12/lines 1-10);

- a data module (114) for obtaining (e.g. said subscriber) information requested (325/324 of Fig. 3, col 29/lines 29-38) and passing said subscriber information to the navigation module (Fig. 3, col 9/lines 10-21, 45-51, 65-66, col 8/lines 46-67 and col 16/lines 42-49);

- a session module for maintaining temporary data associated with the subscriber, said session module interfacing with said navigation module;

- a rendering module for obtaining “requisite browser” displayable data based on desired action (e.g. subscriber’s request) (col 43/lines 55-63) and current state associated with said session (col 50/lines 1-30), including converting (354) requested subscriber information to a format specific to subscriber device specific format e.g. client readable format (col 7/lines 15-65) and

- verifying subscriber identity using information inputted by the subscriber, including name, password or cookie (col 49/lines 15-32); however Jammes does not explicitly teach means (“session module”) for maintaining temporary data associated with the subscriber, and communicating “interfacing” with said navigation module;

Gregg disclosure within the invention’s field of endeavor, teaches a hosting server including a session module (col 7/lines 42-47), specifically, a session related module (52) for maintaining session related data (i.e. “temporary data”) associated with a subscriber (col 11/lines 19-30), and for communicating with a subscription access server (34) receiving subscriber access requests (col 6/lines 41-45), session data including temporary data (col 12/lines 1-13, 60-62); further teaching

- a rendering module (74) for obtaining data based on desired action (e.g. apply for a different subscription) and current state (e.g. existing subscriber) (col 8/lines 39-67), the obtained data including browser related data “requisite” (col 36/lines 32-38);

an authentication module associated with said data source module for verifying subscriber credentials (authenticates: col 4/lines 50-54, validates or verifies; col 6/lines 26-31 based on subscriber information "credentials"; col 6/lines 66-col 7/line 27).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made given the teachings of Jammes for accessing web sites in a e-commerce environment over the Web, the teachings of Gregg for improving subscription access system over the Internet would be readily apparent. One ordinary skilled in the art would be motivated to combine the teachings of Jammes and Gregg for customizing and/or personalizing the information provided to the consumer and/or subscriber, based on the browser type and the sites visited by the subscriber, providing client readable/renderable based on the obtained and stored browser type device information making information frequently accessed readily available without user explicitly requesting it.

Regarding claims 2-3, a database associated with said data source module (114 of Fig. 3), wherein said authentication module compares user data with user stored data, said user stored data being stored on said database (Gregg: authenticates: col 4/lines 50-54, validates or verifies; col 6/lines 26-31 based on subscriber information "credentials"; col 6/lines 66-col 7/line 27) and wherein said predetermined format comprises data in URL format (Jammes: Fig. 3, col 17/lines 55-58).

Regarding claim 4, wherein said subscriber information comprises enterprise specific information (Jammes: col 6/lines 32-40 and Gregg: col 1/lines 20-27).

Regarding claim 5, said navigation module extracts an action request from said data in the predetermined format (Jammes: col 17/lines 55-61), passes the action request to the data source module which retrieves any necessary information based upon the action request (Jammes: col 17/lines 61-col 18/line 15); and said navigation module retrieves a "browser specific screen" data corresponding to the action request from the rendering module (Jammes: col 7/lines 15-65 and Gregg: col 36/lines 32-38).

Regarding claims 6-9, the ability to receive information and data requests in remote access device specific formats and convert said information and data requests into data packets (Jammes: col 7/lines 15-65, col 17/line 61-col 18/line 15) and wherein the data network comprises the Internet (Jammes: col 5/lines 48-52, col 6/lines 14-21), wherein the data network comprises a dedicated network connection (Jammes: col 5/lines 48-52), and wherein the remote access device comprises a personal computer (Gregg: col 9/lines 1-15).

Regarding claim 10, as discussed on claim 1, further comprising the steps of

receiving a “subscriber information” request in a predetermined format (e.g. HTTP and/URL)  
(Jammes: see Fig. 3, col 17/lines 55-58);

“navigating the access and transmission” parsing or scanning and/or analyzing the requested  
subscriber information (Jammes; col 17/lines 55-col 18/line 5),

said transmission of the requested subscriber information being in a “subscriber device specific”  
predetermined format (Jammes: see Fig. 3, col 17/lines 55-58); said access and transmission navigating  
step comprising:

“compiling” gathering or collecting subscriber information based on said subscriber information  
request (Gregg: col 8/lines 39-67 and col 36/lines 32-38);

“assembling” processing and displaying said subscriber information into a “device specific  
format” associated with the subscriber device, wherein said predetermined format for said subscriber  
information request differs from said subscriber device specific predetermined format (Jammes: device  
specific format conversion col 7/lines 15-65 and browser type data col 36/lines 32-38); and

transmitting the assembled and rendered subscriber information to said subscriber device (col  
20/lines 45-col 21/lines 64, rendering accessed/retrieved content, col 6/lines 40-45).

Regarding claim 11, this claim comprises limitations substantially the same as those discussed on claims  
3 and 5 same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 12, parsing said subscriber information into an action task and a page specific task, and  
compiling content data based on the information identified on the parsing step (Jammes; col 17/lines 55-  
col 18/line 5).

Regarding claim 13, verifying user credentials using information maintained with subscriber information  
at a (called local) database (Gregg: authenticates: col 4/lines 50-54, validates or verifies; col 6/lines 26-31  
based on subscriber information “credentials”; col 6/lines 66-col 7/line 27).

Regarding claims 14, 16 and 21, this claim is substantially the same as claim 4, discussed above, same  
rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 15, compiling comprises seeking requested information from a (“local”) database  
(Jammes; col 17/lines 55-col 18/line 5).

Regarding claim 17, this claim is substantially the same as limitations discussed on claims 1, 3, 10-11, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 18, wherein verified credentials some reside on a (called "enterprise") database (Gregg: authenticates: col 4/lines 50-54, validates or verifies; col 6/lines 26-31 based on subscriber information "credentials"; col 6/lines 66-col 7/line 27).

Regarding claims 19-20, substantially the same as limitations in claims 1, 3, 10-11, same rationale of rejection is applicable and wherein said navigation module parses said URL subscriber request into identifiable segments, at least one segment comprising a requested action (Jammes; col 17/lines 55-col 18/line 5).

**Citation of Pertinent Art:**

The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Copies of documents cited will be provided as set forth in MPEP§ 707.05(a):

US 5,796,952

DAVIS et. al. teaches where web based content is requested by the client from a first server, standard communication formats (TCP/IP and HTTP protocols), wherein the content may be located on any HTTP server on the Internet. The request content will then be fetched by the client using TCP/IP and HTTP protocols from Server and rendered on the browser. Server programs (CGI scripts) it may collect information from the HTTP request header such as browser type,

US 5,987,480

DONOHUE et. al. teaches receiving subscriber requests in URL format having browser device specific information and transmits device specific subscriber data in a browser specific format. Specifically, receiving data in a predetermined format and accessing device specific information, including extracting from an client request having a predetermined format, device specific information, i.e. browser specific information. In response to a request from a client computer for data, automatically providing data which is compatible with the client computer's browser type. Storing on the web server a

plurality of document templates compatible with a plurality of types of web browsers, automatically identifying at the web server the type of browser operating on the client computer, and selecting one of the plurality of dynamic and static document templates to be populated which is compatible with the client computer's browser type.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prieto, B. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3902. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 3:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Jack B. Harvey can be reached on (571) 272-3896. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, status information for published application may be obtained from either Private or Public PAIR, for unpublished application Private PAIR only (see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov> or the Electronic Business Center at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450


or faxed to the Central Fax Office:

(703) 872-9306, for Official communications and entry;

Or Telephone:

(703) 306-5631 for TC 2100 Customer Service Office.

B. Prieto  
Primary Examiner  
May 11, 2005

  
BEATRIZ PRIETO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER